

Editorial

Henry D. Schlinger, Jr.

This issue of *The Behavior Analyst* (*TBA*) is unique in several ways. First, it contains three major articles that deal, in various respects, with basic experimental problems in behavior analysis. The invited article by Edward Taub presents a review of constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT) with a substantial amount of supporting experimental evidence, both with nonhumans and humans. The general article by James Meindl addresses research using chain schedules on an effect that goes by the name of within-subject contrast or state-dependent valuation. And the target article by Lourenço de Souza Barba tackles the basic research literature on operant variability.

This issue of *TBA* is also unique in that the action editors of the Taub, Meindl, and Barba articles were all guest editors, selected, in part, because of their expertise in the respective topic areas. And because of the special nature of the Taub and Barba articles, I asked the action editors to write introductory remarks to provide some background and context for the reader. In what follows, I offer a few words about each of the articles in this issue.

After the 2011 Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) convention in Denver, I asked *TBA*'s associate editors to recommend any B. F. Skinner Lectures or invited presentations that might make valuable contributions to the journal as articles. Someone highly recommended Taub's presentation on CIMT, so I e-mailed and invited him to submit a written version of his presentation. Because of his knowledge and expertise in the area, I asked Dave Schaal if he would serve as action editor for the manuscript, which he agreed to do.

In his introductory remarks, Schaal introduces the reader to CIMT and Taub's seminal contributions by way of an example of an animal model in rats. According to Taub, CIMT "produces a countervailing alteration in the contingencies of reinforcement" that can improve "motor deficits after stroke, traumatic brain injury, spinal cord injury, and multiple sclerosis, with cerebral palsy in a pediatric population, and for language impairment in poststroke aphasia" (p. 155). Taub's article provides an excellent example of what he calls "behavioral neurorehabilitation" in which the science of behavior analysis can lead to changes not only in behavior but in the brain as well.

The article by Meindl reviews the experimental literature on an effect usually observed in chain-schedule arrangements in which exposure to a less preferred event increases preference for stimuli that follow that event. He finds that the results of studies are not unequivocal and points out procedural differences among the studies that may account for them. Meindl also evaluates the two models that have been proposed to explain the effect, and concludes that neither is sufficient. He then suggests a more parsimonious explanation in terms of motivational operations and function-altering effects.

At the ABAI convention in Seattle last May, I heard Travis Thompson deliver one of several papers in a symposium that paid tribute to the late Joe Brady. I then asked Thompson to submit an *In Memoriam*, but, happily, he submitted a much more substantial paper instead. In it, he describes the truly remarkable accomplishments of Brady as a basic researcher, program builder, mentor, and administrator. He points out that

Brady was responsible, either directly or indirectly, for groundbreaking work in behavioral pharmacology and on experimentally induced stress, the behavior of chimpanzees in suborbital space flight, developing pre-flight and in-flight testing protocols for human astronauts, and the design of multicompartment living environments simulating life on a space station. As one of the many well-known behavior analysts recruited by Brady, Thompson mixes personal remembrances with research citations to describe the remarkable life and work of Brady.

In our target article, Barba critiques Neuringer's claim that variability is an operant dimension of behavior. Ever since Pryor, Haag, and O'Reilly (1969) first demonstrated the differential reinforcement of novel responses in a porpoise, numerous researchers, especially Neuringer (e.g., Neuringer, 2004; Page & Neuringer, 1985), have investigated the operant conditioning of novel or variable responding in a variety of species. Although there are some differences of opinion among researchers about what really is being conditioned (e.g., Machado, 1993, 1997), it is generally accepted that a schedule, called a lag n schedule, can produce variable responding. Moreover, lag schedules have been adopted with considerable success by applied researchers, most notably in the treatment of individuals diagnosed with autism who characteristically engage in stereotypic responding and who would benefit from being able to behave more variably (e.g., Heldt & Schlinger, 2012; Lee, McComas, & Jawor, 2002; Miller & Neuringer, 2000; Susa & Schlinger, 2012).

In his sophisticated methodological analysis of the operant variability literature, Barba concludes that the jury is still out on whether variability is indeed an operant dimension of behavior. Dave Palmer, who served as action editor, invited commentaries from major scholars who have

contributed significantly to the experimental and conceptual analysis of behavior, including the literature on operant variability. The target article, the four commentaries, and Barba's reply, along with Palmer's introduction, provide a unique look at some different theoretical perspectives on this literature.

Beginning with this issue, we introduce a new section in which the editor and the associate editors select an article from the journal archives, and then ask either the author or another luminary in the field to comment on it in light of its historical or current relevance. The title of the section, "Upon Further Reflection," was suggested by Matt Normand and is taken from Skinner's (1987) book of the same name. For the inaugural paper, we asked David Pierce to reflect on his article (with Frank Epling), "What Happened to Analysis in Applied Behavior Analysis?" (1980). In his commentary, Pierce laments that not much has changed since he and Epling first noted the "drift in the technical and clinical direction" by behavior analysts. And, not surprisingly, he cites financial contingencies as a major factor that has contributed to what he sees as an even wider gulf between basic and applied behavior analysis. Pierce's commentary is also consistent with recent articles in this journal (e.g., Critchfield, 2011) that reflect discussions in the field about the evolving relations between basic researchers and practitioners.

Next, we present a review by Diller and Nuzzolilli of the book, *The Moral Landscape* (2010), by popular author Sam Harris, in which, as the authors note, Harris offers an environment-based approach to morality, albeit one heavily grounded in neuroscience. Diller and Nuzzolilli use the opportunity both to inform readers of Harris's view that morality consists of behaviors strongly influenced by the social environment and to educate those outside behavior analysis about a

behavior-analytic interpretation of moral behavior.

Finally, it is with sadness that we must include another In Memoriam in this issue. Karen Budd tells us about the extraordinary life of Elsie Pinkston, including the sacrifices she made for her family as well as her exemplary career as a behavior analyst, teacher, and friend.

In closing, I'd like to thank the guest editors for their hard work and diligence in shepherding their respective manuscripts through the sometimes-lengthy review and revision process. And, as usual, I am grateful to my associate editors, Jim Carr and Matt Normand, not only for their work as editors but also for their wise counsel, all of which make my job much easier.

REFERENCES

- Critchfield, T. S. (2011). Interesting times: Practice, science, and professional associations in behavior analysis. *The Behavior Analyst*, 34, 297–310.
- Harris, S. (2010). *The moral landscape: How science can determine human values*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Heldt, J., & Schlinger, H. D. (2012). Increased variability in tacting under a Lag 3 schedule of reinforcement. *The Analysis of Verbal Behavior*, 28, 131–136.
- Lee, R., McComas, J. J., & Jawor, J. (2002). The effects of differential and lag reinforcement schedules on varied verbal responding by individuals with autism. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 35, 391–402.
- Machado, A. (1993). Learning variable and stereotypical sequences of response: Some data and a new model. *Behavioral Processes*, 30, 103–130.
- Machado, A. (1997). Increasing the variability of response sequences in pigeons by adjusting the frequency of switching between two keys. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 68, 1–25.
- Miller, N., & Neuringer, A. (2000). Reinforcing variability in adolescents with autism. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 33, 151–165.
- Neuringer, A. (2004). Reinforced variability in animals and people. *American Psychologist*, 59, 891–906.
- Page, S., & Neuringer, A. (1985). Variability is an operant. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes*, 11, 429–452.
- Pierce, W. D., & Epling, W. F. (1980). What happened to analysis in applied behavior analysis? *The Behavior Analyst*, 3, 1–9.
- Pryor, K. W., Haag, R., & O'Reilly, J. (1969). The creative porpoise: Training for novel behavior. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 12, 653–661.
- Skinner, B. F. (1987). *Upon further reflection*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Susa, C. L., & Schlinger, H. D. (2012). Using a lag schedule to increase variability of verbal responding in an individual with autism. *The Analysis of Verbal Behavior*, 28, 125–130.